

REMARKS

The remarks from the last response with respect to claims 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, and 41 are incorporated herein. With respect to the rejection of claims 42 and 51 based on De Saint Marc, it is clear that De Saint Marc requires two people to perform the asserted method. This is plainly impermissible under the patent law since the method must be done by the same entity.


Nonetheless, the claim has been amended to make it clear that the method is performed at the receiver and, therefore, the assertion that two different entities watching two different receivers could meet the claim limitations is now precluded.

Claim 48 to a system having a storage and claim 54 to software are not suggested by a manual system using two people/systems at two different locations.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2003



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]